



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICA

New York City in Indian Possession. REGINALD PELHAM BOLTON.
(Indian Notes and Monographs, vol. II, no. 7.) Museum of the
American Indian, Heye Foundation: New York, 1920.

This is an unusually interesting as well as valuable monograph. Based on deeds of purchase, charters, and other historical sources, and well related to archaeological evidence, it classifies the Indians of the vicinity of New York City. Eight groups of the Unami Delaware held the lands west of the Hudson, seven of the Wappinger Mahikan those to the east, and thirteen Matouack (Montauk) divisions occupied Long Island. Manhattan was mainly in the possession of the Reckgawawanc Unami, but its southern tip, northeastern Staten Island, and the islands in the East River were in Canarsee Matouack occupancy. An excellent map illustrates these interrelations, besides showing some eighty native stations or sites. In successive chapters the ownership or grouping of Manhattan, the Mahikan, Matouack, Unami, and Staten Island are succinctly reviewed. There follow chapters dealing with land purchases, a list of stations, a classified list of native personal names, and an index of all proper names. There are no citations of the original sources; but the inclusion of these would have rendered the volume cumbersome without adding much of anthropological value. The treatment gives every impression of an accuracy and soundness which render the full presentation of the historical sources unnecessary. As a piece of writing, the publication is pleasing, particularly in the neatness of its style.

Work of this order has much more than local or antiquarian interest. It provides knowledge of the concrete basis of native social, political, and economic life, and thus contributes a foundation for interpretative generalizations.

A. L. KROEBER

Hawikuh Bonework. F. W. HODGE. (Indian Notes and Monographs, vol. III, no. 3.) Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, New York, 1920.

Bonework has been the Cinderella of native Indian handicrafts. In the East it has been overshadowed by the variety and interest of the stone implements; and in the West, particularly in the Pueblo region, pottery has usurped the attention of most writers of archaeological reports. In the present publication, however, the art has finally come into its own; and for the first time the bone implements of an Indian tribe have been fully and satisfactorily treated. How richly these generally neglected little objects have repaid study can be seen by a glance at the excellent illustrations in Mr. Hodge's monograph.

The opening section deals with primary processes in the working of bone and antler. (One might suggest that bone and antler could be more clearly described if handled separately, both for processes of work and in the chapters on implements. The two materials are really quite dissimilar in physical properties, require different methods of manipulation, and produce tools which do not classify well together. I feel quite sure that an Indian would not consider bone and antler as belonging to the same category of materials.) The body of the book is occupied by full descriptions of the various classes of objects; and the conclusion points out the fact that bonework, like other arts at Hawikuh, was practically uninfluenced by 130 years of Spanish contact.

Although bone implements grade into each other in a way that makes classification difficult, a grouping is not, as Mr. Hodge has demonstrated in this paper, impossible. The classification might, however, to my mind, have been carried somewhat further and have been tabulated somewhere in the text. For example: the subgroups into which the author has divided the awls can only be made out by repeated reading of the text and comparison with the plate captions; it would be simpler for the student if he could grasp this grouping at a glance. A tabulation would also have permitted the author to express, by numerical data incorporated in it, the relative abundance of the various types, not only of awls, but also of the other classes of implements. This was done by Morris in his tabulated classification of pottery designs from the Aztec ruin (*Anth. Papers Am. Mus. Nat. Hist.*, vol. xxvi, pt. 1).

The above bit of criticism serves merely to emphasize what is perhaps the most outstanding virtue of the paper, namely the fact that the relative abundance of types actually *is* expressed, so that the reader can get a clear idea of what is common, what is rare, and what is unique. This very important information is all too scanty in most archaeological publications for most writers have emphasized in the text, and particularly in plates, the odd or beautiful specimens; and neglected entirely, or at best failed to stress, the ordinary, abundant, and therefore really most significant specimens which have come from their excavations. Unusual objects should of course be shown, as the finest often represent the highwater marks of local art, and the aberrant ones are likely to be trade pieces, but it should always be made plain to the reader, as Mr. Hodge has done, that such objects *are* unusual.

The book is an excellent exposition of the bonework of this particular site, and is very useful as such; but it stands at present too nearly alone to render the full service that it will eventually give when similar studies have been made for other districts, and one can judge to what degree

their art in bone differs from that of Hawikuh. That there are differences there can be no doubt; Mr. Hodge's book already enables one to recognize a few: the deer-humerus scraper, for instance, so common in the late ruins of the upper San Juan, fails to appear at Hawikuh; the awl-like weaving tool is very abundant at Hawikuh, extremely rare at Pecos.

Such differences are not the result of the animal environment, for that is practically uniform over the three regions just mentioned; they must represent, then, real though unobtrusive differences in the cultural complexes involved. Their very unobtrusiveness gives them a peculiar archaeological value, for the humbler and less considered the tool, the less is it likely to be affected by fortuitous circumstances. Styles in pottery may change because of the chance introduction of new styles of ornamentation, or the acquisition of new clays; architecture may be radically altered by new building materials or the exigencies of a new site. So modest an art as bonework, with so unchanging a raw material, should be, however, much more stable and should help us, if studied as closely as by Mr. Hodge, toward the solution of many difficult problems. For example: the great Aztec ruin is allied ceramically to the later Mesa Verde cliff-houses, and architecturally to the large pueblos of Chaco Cañon. At present we have no way of knowing whether the Aztec people merely borrowed from their two neighbors impartially, or whether they were basically related to the one or the other of them. If, however, we should find that their bonework, an art to which they hardly gave a second thought, was closely akin to, say, that of the Mesa Verde, and different from that of Chaco Cañon, should we not have a very weighty argument for considering them as allied to the former?

I certainly do not wish to insist that the problems of Southwestern archaeology can be settled by the study of bonework alone. As a matter of fact most archaeologists, the reviewer included, have been all too prone to work along single favorite lines, to overemphasize certain categories of evidence: one has a penchant for architecture, another for pottery, a third for clan migration-tales. All are valuable, but so far at least no one has been proved more valuable than another, because no single site or district has yet been considered from all points of view, and therefore it is not possible properly to weight the different classes of evidence. The present intensive excavations at Hawikuh, Aztec, the Chaco, and Pecos give promise, however, of a new era in Southwestern archaeology, one of the first signs of which is Mr. Hodge's unassuming but highly important paper. The present review is really a plea to all field-men to "go and do likewise."

A. V. KIDDER